

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIAJANVIER VILLARS,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
PAM BONDI, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-04239-RS

**ORDER DENYING APPLICATION FOR  
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER**

Plaintiff Janvier Villars filed this “Emergency Petition for Declaratory Relief, Emergency Injunctive Relief, and Constitutional Restoration” and demand for “immediate judicial action under the First, Fourth, Fifth, Ninth, Tenth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, the Supremacy Clause, Article III, and applicable federal statutes.” Dkt. No. 1-1 at 2.<sup>1</sup> He seeks, amongst many other forms of declaratory and injunctive relief, a temporary restraining order against multiple Florida courts, federal government officials including the Attorney General and the current and former FBI Directors, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and “unknown deep state operatives.” *Id.* at 1.

Plaintiff has failed to justify entry of a temporary restraining order. As a threshold matter, there is no indication any named Defendants have been served. Turning to the substance of the application, Plaintiff has made an inadequate showing of likelihood of success on the merits. Most

---

<sup>1</sup> Although Plaintiff incorrectly filed this Motion as an attachment to his Complaint, this order addresses his request directly.

1 fundamentally, Plaintiff has not provided an underlying complaint making a short and plain  
2 statement explaining his entitlement to relief. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). The Complaint and  
3 accompanying Motion make a myriad of allegations against broad swathes of the federal  
4 government and judiciary, at times naming every barred attorney as complicit in wrongdoing. On  
5 wrongdoing, the Plaintiff takes contractual and private disputes over a condominium complex in  
6 Miami, Florida as illustrative of a “broader national crisis,” incorporating grievances with judicial  
7 supremacy, judicial immunity, and the federal government’s proposed ban of the social media app  
8 TikTok. *Id.* at 8. These documents, which also greatly exceed the page limits set by this district,  
9 do not meet the requirements of the federal pleading rules, particularly Rule 8.

10 These deficiencies are not exhaustive and are merely illustrative of why a temporary  
11 restraining order is unwarranted. Plaintiff’s application for emergency relief is denied.

12  
13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14  
15 Dated: May 20, 2025



---

16  
17 RICHARD SEEBOORG  
18 Chief United States District Judge

25  
26  
27  
28

ORDER DENYING TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER  
CASE No. 25-cv-04239-RS